

MAY 07 2007

Appl. No. 10/803,751  
Docket No. 8856C  
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 12, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

## REMARKS

Claim Status

The Specification has been amended to update the status of the parent application.

Claims 7 and 9 have been amended to define the claimed invention with greater specificity.

Claim 7 has been amended to overcome the alleged indefiniteness. Support for the amendment is found throughout the Specification, especially at page 10, lines 12-19.

Claim 9 has been amended to overcome the alleged indefiniteness. Support for the amendment is found throughout the Specification, especially at page 7, line 24, page 19, lines 17-19 and Fig. 7.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Objection to the Specification

The Specification is objected to by the Examiner. The Examiner is requiring that the status of the parent application be updated. Applicants have amended the Specification to update the status of the parent application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot.

Rejection Under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 7-13 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7 and 9 have been amended to overcome the indefiniteness. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot.

Appl. No. 10/803,751  
Docket No. 8856C  
Amdt. dated May 7, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 12, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

MAY 07 2007

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over [reference]

Claims 1-20 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0203196 A1 to Trokhan et al. ("Trokhan"). The Examiner recognizes that this rejection is based on a 35 USC §102(e) reference.

Pursuant to 35 USC §103(c), Applicants respectfully submit that the Trokhan reference and the claimed invention, as claimed in Claims 1-20, as amended, were, at the time of the claimed invention was made, owned by Applicant or subject to an obligation of assignment to Applicant. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Trokhan is not an appropriate prior art reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-20, as amended, are not rendered obvious over Trokhan.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-20 are rejected by the Examiner on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,811,740 B2. Applicants submit that this rejection is now moot in light of the Terminal Disclaimer submitted herewith.


Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied reference(s). In view of the foregoing, entry of the amendment(s) presented herein, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the pending claim(s) are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By



Signature

C. Brant Cook

Typed or Printed Name

Registration No. 39,151

(513) 634-1533

Date: May 7, 2007  
Customer No. 27752  
(Amendment-Response to Office Action.doc)

Page 8 of 8